



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

19. Fol. 83-85b: *Bayle de la Plaza*. De Lanini.

Cont. Plaça. La plaça soy de Madrid.

This is the same as *El Bayle de la Plaza de Madrid*, of Lanini, published in the *Ramillete de Saynetes escogidos de los mejores ingenios de España*. *Ympresso en Zaragoza, por Diego Dormer. Año de 1672*. See Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 716.

20. Fol. 85b-91: * *Entremes de las quantas del desengaño*. De Benavente.

Desd. Que esté v. m. señor cuidado.

Not mentioned by Barrera, nor is it included in the works of Luis Quiñones de Benavente, published in the collection of *Libros de antaño*.

21. Fol. 91b-93b: * *Bayle del Cazador*. De Lanini.

Cont. Seb. A caçar paxaros salgo.

22. Fol. 93b-96b: * *Bayle de la Pelota*. De Lanini.

Juez. A jugar a la pelota.

This *bayle* is probably the same as *Pelota*, mentioned by Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 640, as the work of Jacinto Alonso Maluenda. It is found in Vol. I of *Bailes manuscritos* in the library of Sr Fernandez-Guerra.

It will be seen that this collection contains the following works which are not published elsewhere: of Lanini, 3 *loas*, 3 *entremeses*, 8 *bayles*; of Benavente, 2 *entremeses*; of Zabaleta, a *loa*; and a *loa* of unknown authorship. Of these *bayles* ascribed to Lanini, perhaps one is the work of Matías de Castro, and another of Maluenda. It is true that the literary value of many of these pieces is not very great, but they often give us a good idea of the life and manners of the lower elements of Spanish society in the latter part of the seventeenth century. They are of philological value, too, for we find many words used in the *entremeses* and *bayles* which never found their way into the more serious forms of literature. At all events, a description of this collection serves to fill a gap in Barrera's bibliography of Spanish dramatic literature.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE DATE OF *AI* IN *CONNAÎTRE* AND *PARAÎTRE*.

The year 1675 is the date now given for the change from the earlier writing *oi* to the modern *ai* of *connaître* and *paraître*. It was in that year that Bérain, an advocate of Rouen, proposed such a change for the class of words in which the sound written *oi* had the pronunciation of *é*, a class to which belonged the imperfect and conditional verbal endings, many adjectives of nationality, and a number of other words, including the two verbs in question. Bérain's proposal has been quoted by Rossmann¹ as the date of the introduction of the modern spelling for all the words involved. No one has attempted to show that a distinction is to be made between the various members of the class, and that in *connaître* and *paraître*, at least, the *ai*-writing was freely employed a half century before Bérain proposed it.

Thurot, it is true,² cites Duval (1604) as writing *paraistre* by the side of *parestre*, though employing *oi* in the finite forms of this verb. But Thurot is interested in the pronunciation only and indicates no further occurrence of such writing at this time. Unless other examples can be cited, the form must therefore be considered purely sporadic.

Of greater importance is a note by Paul Lacroix, better known as le Bibliophile Jacob,³ in which he quotes from *Les Aventures Amoureuses d'Omphalle*,⁴ by Grandchamp, "fait paraistre de les connaistre moins." The quotation is from the preface of this *tragi-comédie*. Jacob's comment is: "on est surpris en effet, de trouver chez lui l'orthographe de Voltaire, c'est-à-dire l'*a* remplaçant *o*, dans les infinitifs paraître, connaître, et cetera."

Apparently Jacob knew nothing of Bérain and considered the *ai*-writing sporadic before Voltaire, for he makes no further reference to its occurrence. Had he looked further, however, into not only this play, but others of the same period, he would have found the *ai* established as a frequent, if not preponderant writing alongside the older *oi*-form.

¹ *Romanische Forschungen*, 1883, page 173.

² *Prononciation française*, Vol. I, p. 389.

³ *Bibliothèque dramatique de M. de Soleinne*, Vol. I, p. 226.

⁴ Paris, 1630, in 8°.

As a proof of this, ninety-four examples can be cited from thirteen plays, written between 1630 and 1639, which show the *ai* spelling used in various forms of the verbs *connaître*, *paraître* and their compounds. It occurs most largely in the infinitive, but also in the present and future indicative, the present subjunctive, and the present participle. The cases are sufficiently numerous to establish the fact that the *ai* existed as a good variant writing for the *oi* in these two verbs as early as 1630. The following examples are illustrative :

Fait *paraître* son lustre avec plus d'avantage.

Les Aventures Amoureuses d'Omphale, Act I, Scene 1.

Que s'il ne *paraist* pas et que je sois trompée, *id.*, III, 2.

Vous *connaistrés* trop tard, *id.*, II, 2.

Tu *connais* mal, *id.*, IV, 1.

Examples of the infinitive occur in Pierre Du Ryer's *Argénis et Poliarque*.⁵ *Cognaître* II, 2 and IV, 2 ; *reconnaître* IV, 4 and V, 2 ; *paraître* I, 3 and IV, 4.

The same is true of his *Argénis*, which serves as the *seconde journée* of the last-named play and was published at Paris in the following year. Twelve cases of the *ai*-spelling are to be found in I, 2 ; II, 3 ; III, 1 and 6 ; V, 3 and 4, etc.

In a third play by Du Ryer, *Lisandre et Caliste*⁶ four examples of *paraître*, four of *cognaître*, and one of *reconnaître* occur in I, 1 and 2, etc.

Reconnaître occurs again in I, 3, of Du Ryer's *Alcimedon*.⁷

Du Ryer's work in general does not show the use of *ai* in the finite forms of these verbs, but in the infinitive it is common, especially in his plays published from 1630 to 1632, where there are thirty cases of *ai*-spelling to eight of *oi*. But the *ai* occurs in other authors of the period : Auvray writes in his *Madonte*,⁸ I, 3 :

Le couchant la flétrit, et la fait *disparaître*.

Georges de Scudéry in his *Ligdamon et Lidiás*⁹ uses the *ai* for the infinitive and future indicative of *connaître* ; as, in,

De grace, Ligdamon, faites le moy *Connaître*,

I, 1 ; tu *connaistras*, II, 2. *Reconnaître* occurs

three times in this play. *Paraître* is found in the same author's *Trompeur puny* IV, 4.¹⁰

A number of examples can be cited from Pichou's *Folies de Cardenio*¹¹ :

Vous *reconnaissiez* les soins respectueux, I, 2.

C'est ainsi que *paraist* une amitié fidelle, I, 3.

Paraissez is found in III, 1 ; *connaissiez* in II, 3 and III, 5. *Paraître* occurs four times.

In 1634 two plays appeared that give the *ai*-spelling : *La Clénide*, by La Barre, shows *connaître* I, 3, IV, 5, and V, 3 ; *reconnaiss* in IV, 4 ; *connaist* IV, 2 ; *paraist* II, 2 and IV, 1 ; *paraïsse* in II, 1 and III, 2. *Luciane ou La Credulité blasmable*, by de Bénésin, gives five cases of *paraître* in III, 4 ; IV, 1 ; V, 2, 4 and last scene : and two of *paraissant* in IV, 3 and V, last scene.

Eleven examples of the *ai* are found in Du Rocher's *Indienne Amoureuse*¹² : *je connais* V, 4 ; *tu connais* II, 2 and V, 5 ; *vous connaissez*, twice in II, 5 ; *tu connaistras* V, 5 ; *vous connaissez* V, 2 ; *connaître* III, 5, IV, 3, V, 4 ; *reconnaître* V, 5.

Finally, in Beys' *Ospital des Fous*,¹³ a stage direction to II, 1, reads "Aronte *paraist* poursuivy de quelques soldats." *Paraître* occurs in III, 1 and IV, 7. In the latter case it rimes with *connaître*.

These examples are sufficient to show that the *ai*-writing had now come into good use. It remains only to explain why it is found in *connaître* and *paraître* fifty-five years before its general usage in such other forms as the imperfect and conditional endings, or in national adjectives. The reason is not far to seek, when it is remembered that the force of analogy is particularly strong in verbs and that we have at this time five *-stre* verbs, *naître*, *paître*, *connaître*, *paraître*, *croître*, of which the last had frequently, the others always, the pronunciation *g*, while two showed etymologically the *ai*-spelling, which was now used to represent the *g*-sound only. The *oi*, on the other hand, had become ambiguous, since in a very large number of cases, it was pronounced *ya*, as it is to-day. What was more reasonable than that the *ai*-writing, already employed in two of the five verbs, should be extended to the others, thus making uniform the spelling of the *-stre*-

⁵ Paris, 1630, in 8°.

⁶ Paris, 1632, in 8°.

⁷ Paris, 1636, in 8°.

⁸ Paris, 1631, in 8°.

⁹ Paris, 1631, in 8°.

¹⁰ Paris, 1635, in 8°.

¹¹ Paris, 1633, in 8°.

¹² Paris, 1635, in 8°.

¹³ Paris, 1639, in 8°.

verbs and avoiding the ambiguity involved in the use of the *oi*? So we find the *ai* used as shown above in *connaître* and *paraître*, and even in *craistre* of *Les Aventures Amoureuses d'Omphale* II, 2. A similar working of analogy is attested by forms of *croire* that are written with an *ai* in the same play; as, I, 2; IV, 2 and 3; V, last scene. This view is, moreover, supported by the fact that Du Ryer in his *Argénis et Poliarque*, one of the two earliest plays quoted above, uses the *ai*-spelling (except in the case of *paraistre* IV, 4) only when *paraistre*, *cognaistre*, or *recoгнаistre* are brought by the rime into close relation with *naistre* or *renaistre*. When not so used, they are written *oi* as in I, 3, IV, 2, II, 3, even when the infinitives rime with each other as do *paraistre* and *cognoistre* in IV, 1. This phenomenon is not observed in later plays, but its occurrence in this early work goes to confirm the explanation given of the analogical influence of *naître*, *paraître*, and their compounds, on the early *ai*-writing in other verbs.

The following conclusions are accordingly reached:

That the change by which the present *ai*-writing replaced the previous *oi*-writing did not occur in all words at the same time; that the verbs *paraître* and *connaître* show the later writing as early as 1630; and that the change at this time is probably due to analogy to *naître*, *paraître* and their compounds.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Johns Hopkins University.

FERDINAND BRUNETIÈRE (1849-1906).

After Gaston Paris, Ferdinand Brunetière.

The first devoted to minute research work, only occasionally rising to synthetic views, never too affirmative and always anxious to leave the door open to other explanations and interpretations; the second combative and dogmatic, and always desirous to subordinate mere erudition to thought and action.

It is the pride of a country to produce men of such different types, both the honor of contemporary criticism and scholarship.

Brunetière was born in the south of France, in the middle of the nineteenth century. He came to Paris for his studies, which were for a while interrupted by the Franco-Prussian war. He had no means, and no useful acquaintances of any sort. When he was received in the French Academy, the new colleague who introduced him, recalled in his speech how, with a great desire to see and to learn but without money to go to the theater the young student enrolled himself several times in the "claque." He fought his way to the top in a remarkably short time. At the age of twenty-five he entered the *Revue Bleue*, at twenty-six the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and after Buloz he was made Directeur-gérant.

His bitterest experience in life he had at the end of his brilliant career, when he was refused the Chaire de littérature française, at the Collège de France, and when his name was ignored at the time of the reorganization of the École Normale Supérieure, where he had formerly been a professor. Finally, about two years ago, he had the great misfortune to lose his voice, and thus was deprived of the kind of activity which he enjoyed most of all, lecturing. His friends have already told us of the stoicism with which he bore these trials.

He worked until the end. On the day before his death he was still reading a manuscript for the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

Brunetière combined admirably the two chief requirements of the modern scholar. His information on all subjects, and in French literature in particular, was immense. But he never allowed himself to be absorbed by his erudition. It was not enough for him to know; he dominated his subjects and passed judgment over ideas and men. Possessed with a dialectic power which at times reminded one of Pascal himself, he was too superior a man to be satisfied with the ideal of so many of our contemporaries, knowledge for the sake of knowledge.

He was one of the most active minds of our generation. He never allowed an occasion to pass without breaking a lance for his convictions and his ideals. No one has taken up and treated with more vigor the principal problems of our epoch, and by his straightforwardness and his eloquence raised so many passionate discussions.